

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, November 13, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

GRASSHOPPER MENACE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture received any further reports relating to the infestation of grasshoppers in the northern areas, which was mentioned in the press recently?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Mr. J. D. McAuliffe, Agricultural Adviser in the upper northern district, reported on November 12 that he had inspected the area north of Quorn from which reports of grasshoppers had appeared in the press. He stated that grasshoppers had hatched in small areas over a total of 20,000 acres. They were, however, not in plague numbers and he did not anticipate any trouble. A parcel of the grasshoppers forwarded from Cradock to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute had been examined by the entomologist, who advised that they were the small plague grasshopper (*Austroicetes* type) which did not migrate and which produced only one generation a year. In other words, the eggs laid by this type would not hatch until next spring. Apparently the plague is not as bad as reports indicated, and it is not the worst type of grasshopper.

DINGO BAITING.

Mr. MICHAEL—An extract from the annual report of the Museum Board appearing in the *Advertiser* this morning says that because of dingo baits "every native animal is said to be gone and even natives cannot find them." During the recent debate on dingo baiting reference was made by Mr. Shannon and me to the danger to useful animals and birds of indiscriminate baiting in the outback. Has the Minister of Lands seen the report referred to, will he take steps to investigate the assertions therein and in future see that care is exercised in dingo baiting so that useful animals and birds will not be wiped out?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I did not see the report referred to, but will do as the honourable member desires and obtain a report for him.

ROYAL VISIT.

Mr. DAVIS—Yesterday the Premier advised me that the Government would grant reasonable railway concessions to children desirous of

coming to Adelaide to see Her Majesty the Queen. I find that the fare for a child from Port Pirie to Adelaide is 17s. 1d., and from information I have received from school children they will be asked to pay 16s. Does he consider that a reduction of 1s. 1d. is a fair and reasonable concession?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Frankly, I did not know what concession had been granted. The matter came up for discussion in Cabinet as to what concession fares would be granted to children, and the suggestion made at that time was that the usual holiday concession fares should apply. Since the honourable member is interested in the amount, I will examine what the proposed concessions are, and if I do not think they are adequate I will again raise the matter with my colleagues. If the figure is as quoted by the honourable member, I should not think it is a sufficient concession.

Mr. RICHES—Can the same concession as regards excursion fares be extended to areas that are not served by railways but depend on bus services for their regular transport?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think I said in answer to a question yesterday that I had no doubt that the £15,000 mentioned by the member for Port Pirie would be exceeded because if the railways are asked to make concessions they normally request that they be charged up against the line "Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous." Judging from past experience I am sure something along those lines will happen again. I point out that a grant to bus services would not be analogous because when the railways make any concessions they charge it to a Government department and it is credited back to the Treasury in the form of revenue, whereas if we make grants to bus services they will not involve only a transfer entry, but an outgoing that would not come back. People will be expected to take care of their own transportation in regard to the Queen's visit. That is a physical matter completely outside the scope of the Government's power and finances, and I believe it is not being undertaken in any other State.

Mr. WHITE—Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 30 regarding the allocation of portion of the route to representatives of local governing bodies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question has been examined and the following letter sent to the secretary of the Municipal Association of South Australia by the State Director of the Royal Tour:—

I have for acknowledgment your letter of October 16, 1953, in which you request that accommodation be reserved for members of

local government bodies and their wives wishing to view the Royal Progress through the city of Adelaide on Friday, March 19, 1954. Reserved street space along the route of the Royal Progress is being allotted on the merits of each application and only after due consideration has been given to the requirements of the general public. For this reason, sufficient accommodation can be reserved to enable only a representative gathering from each organization to assemble as a group. I am in a position to allot your association a section of reserved street space with a frontage of two and a half chains, to accommodate approximately 500 members of the local government bodies on the southern side of North Terrace, *vide* the attached plan. This reserved space will extend from street barriers back to the gutter kerb line only, the footpaths in rear being left clear for the general public. No difficulty will be experienced in accommodating 500 adult persons if the reserved space is occupied on the basis of six rows each of approximately 33 persons to one chain of road frontage.

As the policing and the general control of this area will be the responsibility of the members themselves, it is suggested you arrange for ten adult persons to arrive early on the morning of Friday, March 19, 1954, to act as marshals. The official badges necessary to give authority to these marshals will be forwarded to you in due course. To enable the members selected to gain admittance to this reserved area it will be necessary for each to be in possession of a form of pass issued by the Local Government Association. In addition, your association will be required to display a banner or device to indicate precisely the name and nature of the organization. All reserved space along the route of the Royal Progress is to be occupied by 10 a.m. on Friday, March 19, 1954, at which hour any unfilled space must be made available to the general public.

PREVENTION OF GOITRE.

Mr. SHANNON—Has the Premier a reply to my question of November 4 regarding the use of iodized salt to deal with endemic goitre?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the Director-General of Public Health:—

Endemic goitre is not a common trouble in South Australia. In the South-East, and to some extent in the Adelaide Hills areas, evidences of it are noted. In places where goitre is common there is usually an iodine deficiency in the soil. Small, regular doses of iodine, in the form of potassium iodide or other saline compound, prevents the trouble in such localities. For the prevention of endemic goitre the addition of a small amount of an iodine compound to some common article used as or with food, such as bread or salt, has been recommended by medical authorities. I know of no valid reason against such a plan. The matter of goitre prophylaxis has been frequently considered by the National Health and Medical Research Council. At the forthcoming

meeting in December I shall introduce this aspect of the matter—the compulsory “dosing” of salt—for discussion. Some appropriate Australia-wide action may be devised.

HILLS TUNNEL TRAGEDY.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Recently in a tunnel in the Adelaide hills a man died from the effects of gas. It was reported that the Adelaide Fire Brigade was asked, but refused, to provide respiratory equipment to assist the police to get into the tunnel. Can the Premier say whether the police made an urgent call to the brigade for respiratory equipment, was this request refused, and if so, why, and will he give an assurance that any similar future request to the brigade will not be denied?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report on the honourable member's questions. The Fire Brigade is not directly under Government control, its board being largely elected by local councils and by insurance companies. I think the only Government representative on it is the chairman. My experience has been that where assistance has been required from the board, and it is capable of being granted, the board has always been co-operative, and I do not doubt that, if suitable steps are taken, it will be co-operative again.

KANGAROO ISLAND ROADS.

Mr. BROOKMAN—My attention is being increasingly drawn to the serious state of the main road connecting Kingscote, American River and Penneshaw on Kangaroo Island. The surface is not bad except for the serious and continuous corrugations over the whole length. Roads on Kangaroo Island are comparatively easy to make but need a tremendous amount of grading—far more, I feel, than they get. On that road there is practically 40 miles of continuous deep corrugation, and when on Kangaroo Island I am shocked to see the deterioration in most of the motor vehicles, many of which are comparatively new. Near Kingscote there are a few miles of bitumen, but from there onwards the road is a series of bad surfaces and the effect of these on shock absorbers is devastating. Indeed, I have been told that only a few cars at Penneshaw still have shock absorbers. Can the Minister of Works say whether increased assistance could be given to keep the road better graded and make it better and safer for the users, and when the recommendation of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services that that road be bituminized is likely to be implemented?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member was good enough, after his last visit

to the Island, to indicate that he would ask this question; consequently I had some inquiries made. The road is under the control of the district councils of Kingscote and Dudley. Funds were made available early in the financial year for maintenance purposes, which funds have not yet been called upon, and until they have been exhausted in keeping the roads in a reasonable condition, little further assistance can be given. It is up to the councils to show that it can do the job and then to apply in accordance with its requirements. If and when the money made available to it has been fully expended I am sure the honourable member's representations will not be overlooked. I will take up this matter with the Highways Commissioner to see whether in keeping with the traffic on the road additional funds should be made available. Apparently, the councils thought other roads should get prior attention, and it is no use their blaming anyone else for the fact that, as is the case in many other places, they are unable to keep pace in every direction with the increasing requirements of the district.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Can the Minister of Works say when it is expected that the recommendation of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services for the bituminizing of the main Kingscote-Hog Bay road is likely to be implemented?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Several recommendations regarding harbour works and road improvements were made by that commission. I will bring down as early as possible a report on the stages reached in and future plans for the implementation of such recommendations.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE DAIRY HERD.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Because of the generosity of the Minister of Agriculture, last Friday a number of members of this House and another place visited the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Members were surprised and pleased to see the work being carried out there, not only in teaching but also in research. I was most interested to hear a report on the butterfat production of a number of cows, particularly those which we were shown. The information is so valuable that it should be made public. Has the Minister a statement on the butterfat production and feeding of those cows?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that he and other members who visited the college profited by the visit. It was arranged

that members might see something of the work there, because we have always felt that we had something to show to members that was worthy of their attention. I am pleased to note from the honourable member's remarks that he took particular interest in the various aspects of the work, and particularly those demonstrated to members. The herd referred to is of pedigree Jerseys, free from T.B. and C.A.B. The number of cows being milked is from 40 to 45. Average production for all cows finishing 273-day lactation in 1952-53 was 321 lb. of butterfat, which is equal to 379 lb. of commercial butter. Among the high butterfat producers which members saw was one cow which carried off the first prize in the Commonwealth for its class. The herd grazes in paddocks adjacent to the dairy. Grazing is abundant in winter and spring. It is extended by oats sown on stubble land which usually means plenty of grass from May to October or November. At all times the herd is supplementary fed by silage or hay in the paddocks. Irrigated lucerne in small paddocks near the stubble is cut and fed to the herd in the period of scarcity. This ration is never more than 10 lb. of wilted lucerne per head per day. Right through the year, the cows in milk get pressed grain in the bails. This amounts to 3 lb. per head per day in the winter and is increased in the summer by 3 lb. for each gallon of milk over 2 gall. The cows are milked by machine and stripped by machine. Milking is supervised by a herdsman but done by students. Because of the lecture programme, the students' milking team is changed four times per week. All milk is weighed and tested for each cow once per week.

YALATA STATION.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—As the Minister of Works will recall, in any discussion on the matter he has always said that any disposal of surplus land from the Yalata Station property will be determined by three authorities, the Aborigines Protection Board, the Pastoral Board and the Land Board. Recently some officials from these authorities were in the district and inspected the station. Whilst there the settlers sought the approval of the Minister to place their case before these officers. Representatives were appointed and a case was made out at a meeting at Coorabie which was attended by practically all the local settlers, numbering about 60. This shows how strongly the settlers feel about the proposal to introduce into their midst the natives from Ooldea. I do not intend to discuss the merits or

demerits of the dispersal of the natives in the area, but the settlers themselves are anxious to know their fate. Can the Minister say whether any agreement has been finalized with Koonibba Mission authorities in regard to taking over the Yalata Station, what conditions may attach to the establishment of a mission station in the area, whether any of the land has been set aside for allotment to local white settlers, or what other arrangements may be made to establish some sort of buffer between the white and the native settlements?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I would prefer the opportunity to make a more considered statement on the matter after the Yalata Board, which comprises the Premier on behalf of the Crown, myself and members of the Aborigines Board, have considered the representations of all parties, of which there are several. First there is the Government, through which Parliament is represented, the people who will administer the station, the natives and the local white residents. The object in purchasing the station at the outset was to establish a home for natives, and that primary object should not be overlooked. It was never intended to be a subdivisional proposition for the establishment of new settlers or to add to the holdings of others. On the other hand, if there is any surplus land, and its excision would not be detrimental to the original purpose, it will be made available to others. Up to the present only a small portion has been considered surplus, and we must consider whether it can be made available without detriment to the original purpose. For instance, if the people administering the station say that without it they cannot carry on, the whole purpose will be destroyed by making the land available to others. The question is complex, but it has not been in any way aggravated, and the Lutheran Mission has been earnest in its desire. The Land and Pastoral Boards have one aim in common, to establish a home for natives in keeping with the desire of Parliament, giving the older natives the opportunity to have a walk-about and the younger ones an opportunity to gain a knowledge of pastoral pursuits, and generally to make it possible for better conditions to obtain than obtained at Ooldea. Towards that end we have progressed greatly and within the next week or so we shall be able to have a meeting of the two boards, and the result will be made known. It is not possible for me to say in advance what the decision of the joint board will be. On the West Coast it was thought by some that the natives' interests

would be secondary but that would destroy the whole purpose of the scheme. There must be a line of demarcation, but no matter how far west it is there will still be some people who will object because they will be on the boundary. I represent a district in which there are natives and I know that with the proper control that will come from the Lutheran Mission it will be found that the natives are good citizens, and a benefit rather than a detriment.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—One of my constituents is engaged in the business of timber felling and cutting mainly for posts and beams, and he has used a power saw equipment, but has found that his light powered motor car cannot cope with it. He purchased a large secondhand American car for the purpose and is concerned about the high registration fee, with the possibility of an increase. He is engaged mainly in providing posts and general timber for primary producers in the district. Can the Premier say whether there is any concessional registration fee under the present Road Traffic Act for this man, and many others in similar circumstances, and, if not, will the Government consider amending the Act to provide some concession in registration fees for such cases?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The only concession of the type mentioned by the honourable member concerns a primary producer who uses a vehicle for the purpose of primary production on his own land. I do not think there is a concession for a man in business in a general way, although it may be possible for him to set the cost of running the motor car and all its associated expenses against his income in his taxation return. I know it has been allowed as a taxation deduction. Of course, it may be used for business in only a small way.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Then he could claim a proportion.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, I have not the slightest doubt that it would qualify as an allowance to the extent that it was used for business purposes.

PORT BROUGHTON RAILWAY MATERIALS.

Mr. HEASLIP—Has the Minister of Railways any further information to give in reply to the question I asked last week about the disposal of surplus materials from the Port Broughton railway?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I took the matter up with the Railways Commissioner. Most of the rails are of iron, which is of great value to the Chief Mechanical Engineer for forging in the Islington workshops. Therefore, the commissioner regrets that it would be entirely uneconomic to make them available for other purposes, but there is a quantity of steel rails that he will be glad to make available to people in the district at standard rates. The sleepers are not in very good condition, but they will be made available locally and the price will be regulated in accordance with their condition.

MOTOR CAR THEFTS.

Mr. STOTT—It has been brought under my notice that recently there has been a great increase in the theft or illegal use of motor cars. One offence is that of stealing a car, the other involves the abandonment of a car after illegal use. Under the Act the court has power to imprison an offender for up to 12 months for a first offence and for up to two years for a subsequent offence. Will the Premier take up this matter with Cabinet to see whether a greater deterrent can be imposed on the commission of these two offences?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know where the honourable member obtained his information, but if my memory is correct I have already answered a question this session on this topic. I believe the Commissioner of Police pointed out that the number of car thefts had declined fairly steeply and that all stolen motor cars had been recovered, except four. Before I answer the second part of the question I would like to see whether it is based upon accurate information. I will get a report and advise him in due course.

ANGASTON PRIMARY SCHOOL YARD.

Mr. TEUSNER—About four months ago, at the request of the Angaston Primary School Committee, I inspected the school yard and discovered a considerable number of pot holes in the paved portion, while much of the unpaved portion was a quagmire. I made representations to the department, and an officer was sent to inspect the yard. I understand a recommendation was made that the asphalted portion be repaired and the rest of the yard asphalted, but so far nothing further has been done. As this is a consolidated school, attended by a large number of children—I think over 300—and in view of the danger to children of the yard in its present condition, will the Minister representing the

Minister of Education do everything in his power to have the recommended work expedited?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am sure the honourable member is aware that never in the history of the State have we been able to catch up with all requirements. There always remains some lag, and the most urgent works have to be done first, but in pursuance of his request I will follow up the question and let him know the actual position. I am sure the department is anxious to do these jobs in order of priority. If the repair to the Angaston school yard has missed out I will see that it does not miss out in the future.

BOTANIC PARK ROAD.

Mr. TRAVERS—The road through the Botanic Park is by far the shortest and most convenient between the city and a substantial portion of Hackney, St. Peters and Joslin. Until recently it was available at all hours and was extensively used, but now the gates are closed at 6.30 or 7 p.m. Certain correspondence has passed between the St. Peters Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Botanic Garden and a perusal suggests that the board has lost sight of the fact that under the Botanic Garden Act it acts merely as trustee or manager. The letter from the town clerk to the board is as follows:—

At a meeting of this council, held on the 15th inst., I was instructed to inquire from your board as to how long it was anticipated that the Botanic Park will be closed to the public at night times. This council is receiving a number of complaints from residents of this and neighbouring municipalities relative to the inconvenience caused to the travelling public by closing the driveways through the park after 6.30 p.m., and it would, therefore, be pleased to receive your board's views on the subject.

The following letter, dated November 11, was received from the board:—

The Board of Governors, Botanic Garden, have directed me to acknowledge your letter of October 16 and to advise that it will be some time before there is any likelihood of the Park being opened again at night. My board also wishes to draw your attention to the fact that the roads within the Botanic Park are private and not public roads.

Will the Premier obtain a report as to the need for such closing and its probable duration?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The park is nominally under the control of the Botanic Garden Board. I am unaware of the reason for the closing of the road. As far as I know there has been no Government request for it. I will make inquiries and advise the honourable member.

INSURANCE OF THEATRE FIREMEN.

Mr. DUNSTAN—It is the rule that theatre proprietors must employ fire watchmen in their theatres and these men are also normally engaged in other employment. A dispute has arisen between them and the theatre proprietors as to whether they should be insured for the full amount of the liability of the theatre proprietors under section 21 of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Will the Premier have the matter investigated by the Factories Department to see whether the theatre proprietors are carrying out their duty under section 108 of the Act?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

COURSING OF LIVE HARES.

Mr. LAWN—Last night's News featured a statement by Mr. E. A. Banister, Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, concerning live hare coursing. The press report contained the following:—

Live hare coursing was legalized cruelty in South Australia, the RSPCA secretary (Mr. E. A. Banister) said today. He was discussing a Sydney report that the N.S.W. Cabinet would abolish live hare coursing. Mr. Banister said it was a grave anomaly that the so-called sport was exempted from the provisions of the S.A. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act.

Will the Premier investigate Mr. Banister's statement in regard to both the assertion that it is legalized cruelty in South Australia and the statement that the New South Wales Government is abolishing live hare coursing, and submit the matter to Cabinet with a view to the Act being amended to prevent live hares from being torn to pieces by a pack of dogs?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter has been discussed in the House on a number of occasions and the present provisions are those which Parliament approved after full discussion. In the time that will be available I cannot hope to have the matter reviewed as suggested so that legislation can be introduced this session. However, I will have the matter examined to see whether the Government would be prepared to consider the introduction later of legislation on the lines mentioned. The honourable member must not place too much weight upon that, because there are many things done in New South Wales which we do not necessarily follow in South Australia.

NARACOORTE SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. CORCORAN—I understand that, although the Public Works Committee considered and approved of a sewerage scheme for Naracoorte, it has not yet furnished a

written report to the Government. Can the chairman of the committee state the reason for this delay and say when he expects that report will be furnished

Mr. CHRISTIAN (Chairman, Public Works Committee)—The committee reached a decision on this question in August last, but the report has not yet been prepared because the committee concentrates on the investigation of those schemes which it knows the Government is prepared and able to proceed with. Interim reports have been furnished in respect of sewerage schemes for Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Port Lincoln, and if we have information to the effect that the Government is prepared and able to proceed with such a scheme at Naracoorte, we can immediately furnish an interim report to enable that work to proceed.

HONEY CONSUMPTION AND BOARD'S REPORTS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Honey Board is obliged to report to Parliament on its activities, and can he ascertain the *per capita* consumption of honey for the year immediately preceding the establishment of the board and for succeeding years up to the last financial year?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—My recollection is that, under the Honey Marketing Act, the board is not obliged to report to Parliament but I will obtain a definite answer. I do not know whether the figures required by him are available for the year immediately preceding the establishment of the board, because in that year honey was disposed of on the open market. However, I will endeavour to get the information.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LEGISLATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In view of the great interest being shown in the proposed amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act, can the Premier make available to members copies of the report of the committee which, on behalf of the Government, recently investigated workmen's compensation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Bill on this matter will possibly be introduced tomorrow, and I will see that members have a copy of that report so that they may study it over the week-end.

FLUKE DISEASE IN SHEEP.

Mr. MICHAEL—An extract from the annual report of the Museum Board appearing in today's press states:—

Sheep fluke is causing grave concern among sheep farmers, snail hosts apparently being distributed through pipelines and by other means.

To the best of my knowledge this dread disease has not been prevalent in South Australia, and I know of no locality, except that around the lakes, where it has existed to any great extent. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his officers have reported on the existence or extension of this disease, and, if not, will he have investigations made to see whether it is being distributed in the manner suggested by the Museum Board's report?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—This disease is only prevalent in marshy areas, and at present experiments with regard to its incidence are being carried out in areas adjacent to the lakes. The results and the information arising from them will be made available to the public by the department.

POLICE AMBULANCE WORK.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to my question of November 5 regarding assistants in police ambulances?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Apparently the person initiating the report referred to by the honourable member was under some misapprehension, for the Commissioner of Police reports:—

No instruction has been issued discontinuing the services of police ambulance assistants. An unofficial arrangement exists that where an ambulance is required for the transfer of patients from one Government hospital or institution to another, porters at the hospitals or institutions are asked to assist the driver in lifting the patients out of or into the ambulance. On all other occasions assistants are provided.

TAPLAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. STOTT—I have received a report from the people of Taplan stating that the water supply there is inadequate; in fact, I understand they are hardly getting any in the daytime and only a trickle at night. With the approach of summer they are naturally getting perturbed. Will the Minister of Works have inquiries made to see whether something can be done to provide a better supply?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—This water supply has existed for many years and the demand for it has greatly increased because of the increase in the number of stock and the

development of the area generally. Consequently, the mains, which were once regarded as sufficient for ordinary purposes, have now become overloaded. By a system of boosting, efforts have been made to increase the volume of water. I could not say whether any further efforts in that regard would be effective, but I will inquire to see whether such action would be feasible. Short of starting at the beginning of the system and enlarging every main, it is futile to try, at the end of the main, to deliver more water. It is an involved question, but I am sure the people realize that over a period of years they have had a wonderful supply and benefited a great deal.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. DUNKS—If the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) passes containing a provision compelling motorists to stop when approaching a stationary tramcar, can the Premier say whether it would be possible for a provision to be inserted compelling people leaving trams to immediately move to the foot-path? Particularly on Unley Road I have noticed that there is a tendency for them not to do so, but wait on the roadway to cross at the rear of the tram when it moves off.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It would be possible to have such a provision, but it would be difficult to put it into operation. In all traffic matters we are prone to disregard educating the motorists and public to do the fair and reasonable thing. If we could have more road courtesy we would achieve much more than by having a rigid provision in an Act of Parliament. I say that because of my experience of traffic in London, where there are immense numbers of people and where the motor traffic is very dense, but much courtesy is shown by motorists and pedestrians. We sometimes try to do by legislation what we should endeavour to achieve by education. I will have the question examined.

BRIDGE OVER MAMBRAY CREEK.

Mr. RICHES—Residents at Mambray Creek have drawn my attention to the fact that on the Main North Road traffic has been held up repeatedly at Mambray Creek after heavy rains, sometimes for 12 and 13 hours. A fortnight ago about 100 motor cars were banked up between Port Augusta and Port Pirie because they could not cross the creek, and residents had to rescue people at various hours of the night. Will the Minister of Works get a report from the department on the possibility of having a bridge over the creek?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1950. Read a first time.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1928-1949.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Payment of Members of Parliament Act, 1948-1951.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1952.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1951.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1) (FEES).

In Committee.

(Continued from November 17. Page 1503.)

Clause 14—"Driver's licence."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move—

To strike out subparagraph (a).

The licence fee to drive a motor car should remain at ten shillings, but the fee to drive a motor cycle should be raised from five to ten shillings. The Committee has already agreed to raising registration fees to bring in an additional £1,000,000 in a full year, but we are not justified in doubling the fee for a car driver's licence. Many families own a car for pleasure purposes and there may be three or four members that drive that car. There are 236,687 people licensed to drive all types of motor vehicles, and the revenue derived from that source is £118,343. There are 4,256 licences to drive motor cycles, yielding a revenue of £1,064. It may be argued that we cannot afford to sacrifice about £118,000 of revenue by carrying my amendment, but on my information we can. In its report for the previous year the Grants Commission penalized South Australia by £261,000 because our registration fees were not up to the average of the three non-claimant States, and penalized us by £8,000 because our licence fees were below standard. However, I doubt whether it is sound in principle to increase licence fees as a means of raising revenue. The licence fees should be only high enough to meet the actual costs of administration and issuing of licences. Obviously the present fee of ten shillings will provide more than sufficient to meet the cost of administering the Motor Vehicles Department.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—By accepting the amendment we would lose about £125,000 in revenue in the forthcoming year. When considering increasing registration and licence fees the Government had to first ascertain how much revenue would be required to commence the rehabilitation of our roads. It then considered what would be the fairest way of raising the revenue necessary. Our experts considered that at least £1,250,000 was necessary. I cannot accept the amendment because the additional revenue to be obtained as a result of this Bill will be barely adequate to do the work required. Also, I cannot accept the suggestion in his speech in the second reading debate that the fee charged was to cover the cost of issue. If that were so, the case for the increase would be unanswerable because

costs have advanced by more than 100 per cent since the driver's licence was introduced. Often the licence fee is not paid by the actual driver, but by his employer. As in every other instance there has been a steep rise in the costs of owning and running a motor vehicle, it seems anomalous that in this particular instance no alteration should be made.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is all the more reason why we should leave the position as it is.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot agree, because as a result of this legislation the Government will be committed to a progressive road policy. I agree with Mr. Macgillivray who said last night that the average motorist does not mind paying a reasonable fee provided he gets proper service. In Queensland the nominal driver's licence fee is 7s. 6d., but one must have a separate driving licence for each vehicle at a cost of 7s. 6d. One can understand the effect of such a provision on a delivering organization. It is absolutely essential that the additional revenue be provided.

The Committee divided on the amendment—

Ayes (13).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McAlees, O'Halloran (teller), Riches, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (21).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Hon. Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. William Jenkins, Macgillivray, McIntosh, Michael, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Quirke, Shannon, Stott, Teusner, and White.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Stephens. No—Mr. Travers.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move the following amendment:—

After "foot" in subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (d) to insert "or receives a pension under the Repatriation Act, 1920-1951, at the rate for total incapacity."

The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has pointed out that the purpose of the amendment is to remedy an omission in the provision for the issue of driving licences at half fee to the various classes of incapacitated ex-servicemen. In the drafting those who receive full rates of incapacity pension for disabilities other than those specifically indicated in the clause were overlooked. The amendment will remedy this

omission, and will make it clear that the concessions in driving licence fees are granted to the same classes of ex-servicemen as receive the concessions in registration fees.

Mr. FRED WALSH—In addition to permanently and totally incapacitated men, does the amendment also apply to those pensioners who receive a 100 per cent pension?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It will apply to both 100 per cent incapacitated and the T.P.I. cases.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) (GENERAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1429.)

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—The ground has been well covered by previous speakers on this Bill and I do not wish to speak at any length. It is mainly a Committee Bill which, I believe, has been framed on the recommendations of various committees which have inquired into traffic problems, particularly those in the metropolitan area where the volume of traffic is continually increasing. Those committees have made their various recommendations as a result of their experience and knowledge, and I, as an ordinary motorist, would lay myself open if I criticized those recommendations, but I feel that, if this Bill had not been introduced, motorists would have been no worse off.

One committee whose recommendations have been considered in framing this legislation is the Australian Uniform Road Traffic Committee. Its very name indicates that it is seeking uniformity, but, although uniformity may be desirable in some cases, it can be overdone, and, in seeking uniform conditions throughout Australia, we may be sacrificing a condition more desirable for local traffic control. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, the Commissioner of Police and the Highways Commissioner, who have all been mentioned in this debate, are all administrative officers competent to deal with traffic control. I believe the State Traffic Committee was the final committee from which came the recommendations in the Bill.

I oppose two clauses. The first is that which provides for the compulsory stopping of motor vehicles behind stationary trams. This clause will not achieve uniformity, but will tend to make conditions less uniform. I remind

members that some time ago they were told that the speed limit should be reduced from 40 miles an hour to 30 miles an hour in order to achieve uniformity with other States, but, although it was changed to 35 miles an hour, that speed has been found to be no more dangerous than 30 miles an hour, besides which it has been found that it enables a freer movement of traffic, minimizing the possibility of traffic being held up by the slower-moving vehicle.

Clause 9 gives power to an officer, an inspector or some other authorized person to direct the unloading of a portion of a load if it exceeds the allowable weight. There is nothing new in this provision. Some members have tried to tell us that it will be possible for an authorized person to direct that a portion of a load be dumped at the side of the road and left there possibly to be damaged by the elements or stolen, but I take it that the driver would be directed to the nearest shelter, probably in the nearest town, and there ordered to unload the excess weight. In the days of steel-tired horse-drawn waggons, certain limits were imposed on loads because of the damage done by tyres to macadamized roads and drivers could be directed to unload the excess weight. This Bill merely perpetuate something which for years has applied to horse-drawn vehicles with steel tyres. It is not right that a man should be able to break the law with impunity, and therefore this clause is one of the most valuable in the Bill.

Clause 11, which deals with the right-hand turn at traffic lights, is rather debatable, and I think it will have to be tried before anybody can say conclusively how it will work. Today, where a police officer is directing the traffic he merely has to signal the driver at an intersection to turn to the right and is thus able to keep the traffic moving, but where traffic lights are operating it will be left to the driver to decide whether it is safe to turn. However, I believe that any man entrusted with the control of a motor vehicle in traffic should possess enough common sense to know when it is safe to proceed.

Pedestrians move with the lights and this automatically blocks the way for motor vehicles turning to the right. Pedestrians will have to wait whilst the traffic passes, and I doubt the benefit of accepting the proposal, but we can give it a try. We should not have too many traffic rules. I do not know that Great Britain has any more than we have, yet she has many more motorists and much more congested traffic. Whenever we

experience difficulty we amend the legislation, and the stage is soon reached when the motorist is completely confused. More should be left to the commonsense of the individual. We should not have legislation which few people can understand.

I shall vote against clause 12, which makes it compulsory for a motorists to stop before passing stationary trams. Where traffic is controlled or there is a safety zone the motorist can pass, but where there is no safety zone or the tram is at a terminus, even if it stops there half an hour and there is no danger of accident, the motorist must stop. I cannot imagine a provision which will cause more congestion. It is likely to cause a banking up of motor vehicles for several hundred yards. There is nothing uniform about the proposal and it will be most confusing to motorists. Mr. Dunks suggested Stop signs on North Terrace but that would only add to the traffic congestion. If a motorist can decide for himself without creating a danger to pedestrians, why have the proposal in clause 12? Statistics have proved that there is not much danger associated with motorists passing stationary tramcars. In the metropolitan area in the last two and a half years there have been 55 accidents to people boarding or alighting from tramcars. The risk to the individual when a motorist can pass a stationary tram is not great. It is far more dangerous for the pedestrian crossing North Terrace at certain spots.

I commend Mr. Fred Walsh for proposing to prevent the parking of motor vehicles at tram stopping places. Often because of parked vehicles and the small space available for a motorist to pass between them and the tram there is a great danger of accident to people boarding and alighting from trams. I would also prevent the parking of motor vehicles at corners, which cause blind spots. It will not be long before the trams disappear and we will have only bus services. Then the problem of people alighting from and boarding trams will disappear. Buses load and unload at the kerb and motorists pass on the right-hand side of them, whereas trams dump the passengers in the middle of the road and they have to get to the footpath the best way they can. There are faults on both sides—pedestrians and motorists. I am whole heartedly behind Mr. Fred Walsh's proposal and shall support it. Clause 14, which deals with stop signs, achieves uniformity. Under it a motorist must stop at the sign but has right of way against vehicles on his left.

He must give way to the person on his right, which provision applies in other States. At present a motorist must wait at the stop sign until the road is clear on both his right and left. He is not even allowed to proceed to the centre of the road. This is a good clause and will help to prevent congestion of traffic at stop signs. These signs are not usually erected on minor roads, but on roads carrying much traffic. At the intersection of the Anzac Highway and South Road there is a stop sign and motorists on the South Road sometimes have to wait for 15 minutes or half an hour to get through when there are races at Morphettville or on hot nights when many people go to the beaches, because of the heavy up and down traffic on the Anzac Highway.

Clause 17 deals with the maximum pressures of tyres, but I will not support this clause without further explanation by the Minister. I do not know why it was included, and when I am not sure about a thing I like to leave it as it is. Tyres reinforced with steel last much longer than the conventional type, and if we can reduce costs the community must benefit.

Mr. Davis—They do more damage to our roads.

Mr. HEASLIP—We have not been told that. I doubt whether they do because they are made of rubber, though reinforced with steel.

Mr. JENNINGS (Prospect)—I agree with the member for Rocky River that this Bill can be more effectively dealt with in Committee, though I was astonished to hear him then go through it clause by clause. I will support the Bill, with minor reservations. It is a step towards uniformity, which is desirable in traffic laws, but that does not mean we should dispense with some good road law because it is not used in other States, nor that we should accept a faulty law because it applies in other States. When a provision has been tried and proved in most States it is a good reason for us to at least give it a trial here, especially when our conditions are comparable with those in the other States. The clause that obliges motorists to stop at tram stops is one of the most controversial, but I support it. It works smoothly in other States and will be a great improvement on our present rule. Some passengers wait patiently for traffic to pass, but others flutter around like flustered fowls, whilst some close their eyes, offer a silent prayer, and make a desperate dash for the footpath. The resultant confusion is a nightmare to both motorists and pedestrians.

The clause will be a step towards safety and serenity. Some members said it would encourage motorists to speed up to pass a tram before it stopped, but the type of motorist who would do that does it now to avoid slowing to six miles an hour. In opposing the clause the member for Stanley said that at a tram terminus, where a tram waits for several minutes before making its return journey, the motorist would have to wait until the tram moved off, and the member for Rocky River spoke in a similar strain, but the clause is clear. It states:—

... shall not drive or ride his vehicle or animal so that any portion of it passes the extreme rear of the tramcar until the movement of passengers into and out of the tramcar is completed and the road is clear.

At a tram terminus the motorist would stop, but could proceed when the road was clear. Another point raised by the member for Stanley calls for an explanation from the Minister. The Enfield tram terminus is familiar to me, and before returning to Adelaide trams wait for several minutes while passengers embark. Probably the road would not be clear at any time while the tram was waiting to commence its return journey. Does that mean a motorist driving south would have to wait until the tram had started? I am prepared to support the right-hand turn against the red light as a trial. I hope those administering our traffic laws will watch the experiment to see how it works. It leaves much to the discretion of the motorist, and though we can depend on the majority to exercise discretion irresponsibly may cause confusion and a traffic hazard to other motorists and pedestrians.

Clause 9 enables an officer to instruct a person with an overloaded vehicle to reduce the load to the allowable maximum. I support this provision, though some members have said it is impracticable and may result in valuable cargo being left unattended. We are not here to protect people who do wrong or help to ruin our roads, but to prevent overloading. Let the punishment fit the crime. When some people have had to reduce their loads we shall not have any more overloading. The member for Mitcham commenced by saying this Bill need not have been introduced, and that there was nothing wrong with our traffic laws. Then he went on to support many of the clauses. If he supported them he must have agreed with them. How does he expect them to materialize without the introduction of a Bill? I was interested in his remarks about the safety of pedestrians

in crossing roads where there are no traffic lights. He suggested a stop sign on North Terrace in front of the railway station so that pedestrians could cross in safety whilst motorists were stopped. Although I agree with what he has in mind, I do not think a stop sign would be the right thing, nor that the Adelaide Railway Station is the only place where protection for pedestrians is required. Some system of assuring safety for pedestrians at crossings should be devised by the adoption of permanent marks on the roadway. I have in mind the zebra crossings in other parts of the world which are easily discernible to motorists. At these crossings the pedestrian has the right-of-way. Members have referred to the position in Sydney, where the pedestrian can walk across roads with greater safety than in Adelaide. At recognized crossings, the pedestrian has the right-of-way and motorists have to wait. Similar crossings should be provided at various places along Rundle Street. With the exception of the Gawler Place intersection, where a traffic policeman is usually on duty, a pedestrian cannot cross the road with any degree of protection. He must trust to luck and dash in front of any passing traffic, and if he is hit it usually seems that it is his bad luck. I hope the Bill will help to reduce the tragic toll of road accidents. Unfortunately, we cannot do much by legislation to encourage motorists to be more patient, courteous and responsible; only by education can we persuade them and pedestrians to apply the golden rules of traffic behaviour. Therefore, it will be necessary to retain such legislation, even though it may be considered restrictive, so that the majority may be protected from the folly of the few.

Mr. TEUSNER (Angas)—The heavy road toll of killed and injured is a sufficient justification for the re-examination of our traffic code to see whether anything further can be done to minimize road accidents. Figures were published in the press on Monday relating to traffic accidents and deaths in South Australia in respect of the period January 1, 1953, to the end of October. They reveal that 126 persons were killed, 14 in October alone. In that month 236 were injured and there were 793 road accidents. It is rather a coincidence that the number of deaths in the last 10 months was the same as for the corresponding period last year. The total number of road accidents during 1951-52 was 8,373, and the number injured in those accidents 2,497 and the killed, 172. Those figures are sufficient justification for a re-examination of the

Act. I believe the Bill is a genuine attempt further to improve the position. It should therefore receive the due and sympathetic consideration of members. Most of the suggested amendments come to us with the recommendation and backing of the State Traffic Committee, which has made a meticulous examination of South Australian traffic problems, and in particular those of the crowded metropolitan area. Some of these provisions have been on the Statute Books of other States for some years, and their incorporation in the Road Traffic Act will, no doubt, be welcomed by the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee which aims at the achievement, so far as possible, of a uniform traffic code throughout the Commonwealth. I consider, however, that we should not slavishly follow the eastern States simply for the sake of achieving uniformity. Let us not, in any enthusiasm for uniformity, delete from our present Act any provisions which the test of time has proved to be beneficial, or add any provision which experience elsewhere than in our own State has proved to be a doubtful advantage. We must be prepared not to sacrifice on the altar of expediency, in the interests of uniformity, any provisions in our own legislation which in the past have effectively met particular traffic exigencies.

As other honourable members have said, it is largely a Committee Bill. Clause 5 deals with the suspension of the licence of a driver who has been disqualified in another State. It has been said by some members, among whom I think is Mr. Lawn, that the power of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to cancel or suspend a licence should be mandatory and not discretionary, as is proposed. I consider that the power should be a discretionary one. That should apply where the offence committed in another State is of a similar nature to the offence provided for in this State, in respect of which there is power for the court to suspend or cancel a licence. Therefore, there must be a discretion. I consider that clause 10 relating to reflectors on bicycles is a reasonable one. It has been my experience that a number of persons who use cycles at night, although they have the necessary lamps attached as provided by the Act, frequently disconnect the generator, leaving the bicycle without a light. In such cases it is impossible, until the last moment, for an oncoming motorist to see the cycle, and no doubt many accidents have therefore resulted. I should like to see some more stringent enforcement of the present provision relating to tail lamps.

If the clause is passed it will assist motorists approaching a cycle from behind at night to detect it. Clause 12, dealing with motorists passing stationary tramcars is very controversial. I must confess that I have had some difficulty in making up my mind whether I should support or oppose this clause. I have taken into consideration the fact that this provision was recommended by the State Traffic Committee, and I am prepared to accept its recommendation. At least it could be given a trial, and if found unsatisfactory could then be amended. Even now many motorists stop when a tramcar is stationary, and that tends to slow up the traffic. I believe it is desirable that motorists should exercise prudence and care when approaching a stationary tram, and I am therefore prepared to support the amendment. I notice that the member for Thebarton has an amendment on the file relating to the parking of motor vehicles near tram stops, and I consider it reasonable. I referred to this matter a year or two ago when the Act was before us for amendment.

Clause 14 deals with stop signs. At present a motorist is required to stop at the intersection of two streets where a stop sign is erected, and is not allowed to proceed unless traffic on both sides of the road into which he is about to travel is clear. I realize that as a result it is often necessary for a motorist to wait a considerable time before he can proceed. Clause 14 will be of substantial advantage for it will help eliminate much confusion. Many motorists believe that the rule of giving way to traffic on the right applies generally, and as a result of this provision the application of that rule will become uniform, for it will apply also in the case of a person coming into an intersection where there is a stop sign and will mean that the traffic on his left will have to give way to him so that he can make his turn to the right and follow the line of traffic.

Clause 18 deals with damage to roads and works, and I welcome it. It will mean that in future it will be unnecessary for any road authority or council to take separate action against a motorist who has damaged a road or any structure on a road, for it will be possible for a court of summary jurisdiction to award compensation in respect of such damages when a defendant is convicted for an offence under section 178. That is highly desirable and similar to section 46 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which empowers a court of summary jurisdiction in a case where a complaint of

common assault has been made to award compensation to the injured or aggrieved party as well as inflict a penalty on the offender. With those remarks I express my approval of the Bill.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—Various speakers have suggested that, because the provisions of this Bill were recommended by the State Traffic Committee, members should accept it, but I do not agree with that argument. I do not doubt that each expert on the committee put forward his arguments to the best of his ability in an effort to have the committee sponsor his suggestions. Indeed, I understand the committee has before it at present more than 100 suggested amendments to our traffic laws, and it appears that it has picked out one or two to try out on the House, but any amendment to the legislation will be the responsibility, not of the committee, but of Parliament.

Mr. Pattinson—I thoroughly agree with the honourable member.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am glad to have the support of the chairman of the State Traffic Committee on that point, because I think an undue responsibility would be placed on any committee if Parliament were to accept its recommendations merely because that committee made them. Clause 3 deals with permits and exemptions for unregistered biddies. This is a specialized subject, and I regret that the specialist, the honourable member for Port Adelaide, is absent through sickness. I know that I voice the wishes of every member in hoping that it will not be long before he is back in Parliament to help us with such clauses. I would have thought a biddy was a Hibernian coleen, but earlier Mr. Stephens explained that it was a common or garden four-wheeled trailer used to transport cargo on wharves and jetties between the ships and the cargo sheds. One would have thought that "trailer of four wheels" would have been sufficient description in this clause, but the inclusion of the name "biddy" will no doubt keep alive a word well-known in the stevedoring industry. I was interested in the liberty—the licence almost—given by this clause to the users of biddies. It has been suggested that the primary producer gets all the special concessions under this legislation, but I point out to members that the clause states:—

The Registrar may without fee grant to any person a written permit authorizing him to draw unregistered biddies on roads by means of registered and insured motor vehicles.

Therefore, the biddy, on which no registration fee need be paid, can be used as an ordinary

vehicles to convey goods in public places. The exemption goes much further than anything in respect of primary producers' vehicles, because paragraph (3) states:—

Any such permit may also contain provisions exempting any persons from the duty to comply, in respect of the biddies, with any specified provisions of this Act.

That is an extraordinary exemption, for the paragraph exempts one particular section from the necessity of complying with the provisions of the Act, and I trust that one of our legal friends, possibly the chairman of the State Traffic Committee, will tell us why. Paragraph (5) states:—

A permit granted under this section shall be sufficient authority for any act or omission purporting to be authorized thereby.

That is loose phraseology for an Act of Parliament, for who is to say what an act purports to do? Only the court can interpret the meaning of that; but, irrespective of that aspect, the owners of biddies will not be covered by the Act. It has been suggested that our traffic laws should be tightened up so as to improve our control over road transport, but in my opinion this clause goes to the other extreme. At this stage I do not intend to deal in detail with all the clauses, because many pertain to subjects of which I have little particular knowledge, but I must refer to clause 9 which gives certain authorities power to order the off-loading of part of a cargo from an overloaded truck. This is merely another attack on road hauliers. Every time the State is in trouble, whether because of a railway breakdown, a waterside workers' strike, or the inability of shipping to carry the cargoes offering, the State Government says, 'We would like to have every haulier's vehicle on the road to solve the economic problem facing the State,' and every time the road hauliers come to the aid of the Government and South Australians generally and carry out the road work of the State to the best of their capacity. The emergency probably lasts a week, and within a week of its termination those men who were previously lauded for saving the State's economy in time of emergency find themselves in the court, convicted and fined hundreds of pounds for doing the same work. As soon as the need passes the road haulier is treated as though he were a rogue and a scoundrel. Why? Is there anything wrong with the road haulier competing with the vested interests of the State? Is there no room for private enterprise to carry on?

Mr. Davis—No.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I agree with the honourable member that there is no room today for private enterprise as soon as it clashes with the vested interests of the State. The Transport Control Board exists for one purpose, to handicap the road haulier in every possible way, although it is repeatedly said that the board's function is to preserve the interests of the railways. However, in serving those interests its activities are detrimental to private enterprise in general and the road haulier in particular.

Mr. Davis—You would like to see private enterprise oust the railways?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. If the railways or any other socialistic undertaking were successful I would favour it. I have nothing against the State's running an undertaking if it can be made to pay, but as a taxpayer, I take great exception to being forced to pay for the inefficiency of a socialistic undertaking.

Mr. Davis—The people using the roads will have to pay for them.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The honourable member is incorrect, because they already pay for them. I have shown previously that the motorists pay about £80,000,000 a year into Commonwealth funds, but instead of the money being spent on roads most of it goes into general revenue. The road haulier and the private motorist are fleeced in all directions. A duty of 12½ per cent has to be paid on imported motor bodies, yet Governments import railway rollingstock free of duty. It is not right to say that the road user does not pay for the roads.

Mr. Davis—Why is there a duty on imported motor bodies?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Years ago the duty was imposed to protect secondary industries in this country. Now it is used blatantly as a form of taxation.

The SPEAKER—I think the honourable member is now dealing with a matter associated with a Bill we have already passed.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Mr. Speaker, I was making the point that a provision in this Bill will impose an additional burden on road hauliers. It will be difficult to give effect to the proposal. I have seen overloaded departmental trucks, sometimes with heavy goods like Stobie poles, where it would be difficult to off-load the excess. A dozen different owners may have goods on a truck going to another State and if there were an excess load whose goods would be removed? The driver would have a great responsibility thrust on him. At

present the driver of interstate trucks must be responsible for his load. It speaks highly for the men employed on the work that the loss in goods transported from one State to another is so nominal as to be almost non-existent. People wanting to send goods to other States prefer the road haulier because they know that all the goods will be delivered at the destination, which cannot be said of State owned railways or privately owned shipping companies. It is owing to the high moral character of the driver and the care taken of the goods during the journey. If goods off-loaded are lost, who is to be responsible? No doubt it will fall back on the driver.

Mr. Quirke—Goods lost would be covered by insurance.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It is a matter which must be considered. The provision is a vicious attack on young enthusiastic men who are prepared to invest money to assist in the development of Australia. One would have thought the vicious system of imposing fines would be enough, but it is not because an extra burden is to be placed on road hauliers. The fines collected from them must amount to thousands of pounds. I assume the money goes into general revenue, but it should go into the Highways Fund. I shall oppose the clause because in a young country like Australia we should do what we can to develop every possible method of transport. I cannot understand why there should be a dual lighting system on bicycles. We should have either an effective tail light or an effective reflector. I prefer the latter, because it is foolproof. Tail lights on bicycles are not always seen quickly and clearly by approaching motorists. The volume of the light depends on the speed of the bicycle. If the cyclist is moving slowly the tail light is dim. A good reflector should be ample, and it would not put the cyclist to much expense. The other provisions in the Bill deal mainly with city traffic and I am willing to listen to what city members have to say about them because they have a greater knowledge of the position than I have. At present I have an open mind in regard to them.

Clause 17 deals with the maximum air pressure in tyres. Mr. Christian suggested that there may be something sinister about the provision. That is a frightening word because it is usually associated with all sorts of malpractice. It is a cloak and dagger line of thought. He said that a company interested in the sale of tyres may keep off the market tyres sold by another company. This

sort of thing has happened in big business. It is the duty of the Highways Commissioner, or the new Minister dealing with highways, to see that roads are built to meet modern needs. Everybody agrees that for years we have been lagging behind progress. City people say that the large truck used by a road haulier is a recent innovation, but we have had it since the days of the last war. Prior to the war a two-ton truck was about as heavy a vehicle as the Highways Department had to worry about, but today there are trucks carrying 50 tons. There is not much wrong with that as all we have to do is to prescribe the weight on the tyres; a truck can carry 100 tons without damaging the road, provided it has enough tyres, but immediately people see a big truck they say, "Here is a big truck smashing up our roads." It is the responsibility of the Highways Department to whom we pay all this good money, to see that the money is used in such a way that the roads will carry heavy loads; and they will not decrease in the years ahead; every year there will be bigger and heavier loads because our railways and shipping are not able to meet the demands upon them.

One of the heaviest loads I have known to be put on the roads was despatched by the Highways Department itself. It was held up at the Blanchetown punt for three or four days because those in charge feared to put it on the punt, but eventually they got permission from Adelaide to take it across. I am not objecting to that, but I do object to the constant complaints about the heavy trucks smashing up our roads. They never yet smashed a road that was properly constructed. We hear a lot, even from the Minister, about the road to the Upper South-East that was damaged during the last railway strike because the Highways Department was forced to give permission to carriers to use it. The truth about that road is that it was never constructed in the first place to carry heavy traffic. If you build a house or anything else that will not stand up to the work required of it, of course you can only lose your money, and I feel that we are losing a lot of money by temporising and building light roads as a matter of expediency. A road was constructed on the south side of the Murray as far as the irrigation areas about 15 years ago and it has carried all the interstate traffic from Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, with a nominal expenditure on maintenance. I estimate that two men with a one-ton truck carrying a tarred mixture to fill in pot holes

could keep hundreds of miles of this road in good condition. I am not blaming the department because it has never had enough money, but when it does it should build roads that will last. It is capable of doing it and that is far better than trying to cover the country with a network of lightly constructed highways.

Finally, clause 18 deals with damage to roads and works and provides that the court may, in addition to any penalty, order the defendant to pay for the maintenance of the road, bridge or culvert by way of compensation for the damage caused by him. That is all one-way traffic and this should not be the case. An instance was mentioned of a man who drove a long distance on one of our main highways without knowing that, because of some defect in his trailer, he was scoring the road behind him. The road user should have the same protection as the Highways Department. Further, there is nothing mandatory upon the authorities to make roads at all. There are Acts of Parliament providing that certain money shall be given them and they "may" do certain things, and I propose to move an amendment to put some responsibility upon those who get all this money, mainly from the motoring section of the public, to spend it upon the construction of roads. I support the second reading.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—There has been some criticism of the way in which this Bill was introduced and it has been suggested in some quarters that it gives effect to the recommendations made by an expert committee and that the Government has simply thrown it into the ring to be criticized. If that is the case I have not much criticism to offer. The Traffic Committee is composed of men who know as much about road traffic as any others who could have been appointed, but I do not believe that they are necessarily always right, and consequently it is only proper that Parliament should discuss the Bill so that members who represent all sections of the community may bring before the House various aspects which might not have come under the notice of that expert committee. This is not a Party Bill and I think that the Government would be prepared to listen to the evidence submitted to the House and abide by whatever decision is taken. I do not drive a great deal in the city and so do not claim to be an expert on traffic conditions prevailing there, but I have my own opinions which I propose to express. Mr. Macgillivray and Mr. Stephens mentioned the "biddy," referred to in clause 3, which is ordinarily used for transporting cargo on

wharves and jetties. I have not been able to find anything in the principal Act which leads me to believe that the use of the biddy is restricted to any particular area and I would like further information from the Minister on that. It seems to me it could be used in any part of the State like any other trailer. Clause 4 deals with drivers disqualified in other States and the right of the Registrar to suspend or cancel drivers' licences. I see no objection to that because if a man is unfit to drive a car in another State he is unfit to do so here.

Clause 9 is causing a good deal of comment. It refers to the penalty on drivers of overloaded vehicles. Mr. Macgillivray used this as an opportunity to suggest, as he does so frequently that the road haulier is full of altruistic motives not held by other members of the community. I entirely disagree with that view. Road hauliers did a very useful job at a time when other forms of transport were held up by strikes and other causes, and I give them full credit for what they did. However, they went into the business, not for altruistic motives, but because they thought there was an opportunity to make money. I do not object to that. Indeed, I commend young men who are not willing to be bound by the unreasonable conditions of the 40-hour week for going out and doing something for themselves. Nevertheless, I claim that the road hauliers do injure our roads without paying a fair contribution to their upkeep and I consider that the penalty for overloading is not unreasonable, even to the extent of their being forced to unload the excess weight on to the roadside. The provision will be administered reasonably. I am sure drivers will not have to deposit perishables or goods that could be ruined by wet weather where they may be damaged. The police officer or inspector would give the driver a reasonable opportunity to take the goods to a place where he could put them under some protection. If a man breaks the law he must be penalized. Overloading damages our roads, so offenders should be forced to unload excess cargo as soon as possible.

Clause 10 provides that bicycles must be equipped with reflectors. I favour the provision, though I do not think it necessary to have a rear light as well as a reflector. I have often seen cyclists without a rear light. They may have expected to get home before dusk, but if a cycle were fitted with a reflector it would always be there and a cyclist would not have to worry whether or not he had a light. One member said that sometimes mud obscures

the rear light, but the cyclist should see that his light or reflector was visible. Clauses 11 and 13 deal with the question of turning against the red light. This will enable congested traffic to be cleared quickly. Before turning the driver will have to see that he will not create a danger to other traffic, but it is a reasonable provision. When a big sporting function is held at the Adelaide oval there is much traffic on King William Road, and this clause will help to clear congestion.

Perhaps there has been more controversy in regard to clause 12 than over any other. I am not enthusiastic about motorists having to stop at a stationary tramcar. Adelaide sprawls much more than Melbourne or Sydney and we have not the same congestion of traffic. This rule may be desirable in those cities, but I am not satisfied it is desirable here at present. Any advantage would be countered by a tendency for motorists to speed up to pass a tramcar before it stops. That would cause as much danger as reducing speed to six miles an hour to pass a stationary tram. Motorists must now see that they do not endanger tram passengers. Most of them are considerate to people getting on and off trams. Some members said it may be necessary for motorists to wait up to half an hour at a tram terminus before proceeding, but the clause states that motorists have to wait only when passengers are getting on and off stationary trams. It would be unreasonable if road users had to wait five minutes at, say, the Enfield tram terminus while a tram was stationary.

When I accompanied a Parliamentary party to Victoria we inspected areas in the Gippsland district and got back to Melbourne one evening. I noticed the unjustifiable traffic congestion at tram stops. Sydney has even more traffic and narrower streets. When I was there last I commented on the way pedestrians had to dodge between vehicles in one-way traffic streets. My friend said that Sydney was a city of the quick or the dead: If you were not quick you were dead. However, I was informed that a party of reporters was sent from Melbourne to inquire into Sydney traffic conditions, and the evidence they obtained showed that there were fewer accidents in Sydney than in Melbourne.

Clause 17 dealing with maximum air pressure of tyres has been criticized by several members. I agree with the members for Eyre and Chaffey that we do not know enough about the necessity for this provision. Traffic

conditions have changed considerably in recent years. We passed from the iron-tired traffic to the light motor vehicle, and it took us some time to provide suitable roads, but today many heavy commercial vehicles use roads never designed to carry them. It seems that we do not yet know how to construct roads to carry heavy vehicles. The member for Chaffey said that the roads should be made to suit the traffic, but he did not tell us how. This clause is a stab in the dark. We do not know how much damage is done by vehicles with tyres inflated over a certain pressure. I shall support the second reading, but reserve the right to be influenced in my vote on several clauses.

Mr. DUNNAGE (Unley)—We are all vitally interested in this measure and are concerned about the traffic on our roads and all problems associated with it. I congratulate the State Traffic Committee on the work it is doing. The members give all matters careful consideration and we should be proud of their efforts. The member for Glenelg has taken a prominent part in the committee's work. With his legal knowledge he can readily appreciate traffic problems and submit appropriate recommendations. I noticed in the press a few days ago that 19,000 new registrations were issued in the last 12 months. Traffic problems are growing, and will continue to grow. I look forward to the day when everyone will own a motor car; in fact, we are fast approaching it. Motor cars are expensive, but they are now almost as necessary as refrigerators. There is almost one to every household now. That is a good thing, because never before have we travelled so widely or taken so much interest in the problems of this State or Australia as in the last 20 years. The advent of the motor car is mainly responsible for this. The motor car has had a greater influence on our lives than any other single factor in the last few years.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—It has had a greater effect on the death roll.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes, but other factors too cause deaths. In olden days notices were displayed bearing the words, "Walk Around Corners" to indicate that there was a danger of horse-drawn vehicles causing accidents. People were killed in those days and will be killed no matter what we do by way of legislation. Motor cars are so perfect that if driven properly there would not be any accidents, but the human element enters and accidents do happen. Speed and drinking are responsible for more accidents than any other

cause. Yesterday I referred to the shoulders of roads wearing away and if a car is travelling at 25 miles an hour with one wheel on the bitumen and the other on a loose broken surface anything can happen. Modern cars can travel safely and swiftly.

Mr. Frank Walsh—What do you mean by "swiftly?"

Mr. DUNNAGE—The honourable member would call 30 miles an hour in his car swift, but a modern car can travel safely at 70 miles an hour on an open highway. There is nothing wrong with 60 miles an hour on an open highway and many people travel at that speed. I always travel between 50 and 60 miles an hour on the open highway.

The Hon. T. Playford—There is nothing wrong with 60 miles an hour on the open highway provided there is nothing wrong but if a tyre bursts you will find that that speed is fast enough.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I agree, but we should not forget that the modern technique is so good that with the new type of tyre a blow-out will not cause the car to capsize.

The Hon. T. Playford—It is easy to turn a car over.

Mr. DUNNAGE—A person can turn a car over at 25 miles an hour.

Mr. Frank Walsh—How do you know that?

Mr. DUNNAGE—A member of this House did it. Drinking is responsible for many accidents and, no matter how the police tackle the problem it is getting worse. Almost every day reports of arrests for driving under the influence of liquor appear in the press. It seems to be one of the social customs that have resulted from the advent of the motor car. Every evening motor cars are parked near hotels and apparently the owners are inside drinking. I do not object to motorists drinking so long as they do not get under the influence, but unfortunately some do. I am satisfied that the penalties for that offence are not sufficiently high and I would favour increasing them and impounding the cars while the person convicted is in gaol. Something more drastic than at present should be done and it is the Government's duty to do it.

The clause relating to the overloading of vehicles is too drastic. An inspector should not have the power to force a man to unload the excess cargo on his vehicle and store it in sheds or buildings near the highway. Some cargoes are extremely valuable and if a driver is only making a single journey from, say, Melbourne to Adelaide, and not travelling that

route again, it would be altogether wrong to make him unload part of his cargo and leave it by the wayside. He may not travel that track again for months. The penalty for overloading could be increased and possibly if a severe penalty were provided for a first offence drivers would not repeat the offence. Both Mr. Hawker and Mr. Michael referred to research into the construction of roads. The whole problem, however, is what can be done with the money available. In other States concrete roads have been built and I believe they are the answer to many of our problems. George Street, Parkside, to which Mr. Dunks referred, is of concrete and was laid many years ago and is still in first-class condition. Fullarton Road is of concrete with a bitumen top and it has paid for itself over and over.

Mr. Frank Walsh—When are you going to reduce your rates?

Mr. DUNNAGE—That cannot be done because we desire to build more roads of that nature. If money and cement were available the best road to construct would be one of concrete with a bitumen surface.

Mr. Dunks—Is it necessary to have a bitumen surface?

Mr. DUNNAGE—I believe it is because the surface can be replaced when it wears down, but if the concrete is broken it has to be torn out and replaced and that is an expensive process. The Fullarton Road was recently resurfaced lightly with bitumen and it is as good as new. I agree that we should conduct research work, but, as the Minister of Works has frequently said in reply to questions, everything depends upon the limited amount of money available and only a certain amount of work can be done. Research work would be costly, but we could easily obtain information about what has been done in other parts of the world. Perhaps officers under the control of the proposed new Minister of Highways could be engaged in collating it to see whether it would be suitable for our purposes. Mr. Riches referred to the effect of heavy traffic on roads and mentioned the road through Horrock's Pass to Port Augusta which has not been top-dressed for about 20 years. That road has spoon drains which prevent traffic from speeding and big trucks with heavy loads cannot travel between 40 and 50 miles an hour on it. That has prevented the road from being torn up, but great damage is caused to roads in the open country along which heavy traffic can speed for long distances. Speed and weight are responsible

for damaging many roads. If we restricted the speed of heavy vehicles it might help overcome our problems and it would certainly be worth trying. Heavily loaded vehicles from the Highways Department and the Electricity Trust also cause damage and many thousands of pounds are spent in replacing and renewing the roads that have been broken up. Several members have referred to reflectors on bicycles. Many years ago it was necessary for a bicycle to be equipped with a reflector, but that law was repealed in favour of lights. However, it is now suggested that a bicycle must be equipped with both light and reflector.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. DUNNAGE—If the provision relating to lights on the rear of cycles were properly policed there would be no need for the amendment. I cannot see that anything will be gained. It has been said that rear reflectors would become covered in mud, but if it were necessary to attach both a light and a reflector both could be covered in mud. Unless the provision is policed it is no use placing more restrictions on cyclists. Although I do not say it would be perfect, the proposal to allow vehicles to turn against the red light is worth a trial. The short right hand turn, introduced some time ago, has proved a great success, and I think that it would be advisable to try out the turn against the light.

The question of motorists passing stationary trams has been debated by the Unley Council on many occasions, the council having been asked by various organizations to support the proposal now before us, but it has always opposed it. If this clause becomes law the position will become extremely dangerous on narrow roads. At present a man can be prosecuted for dangerous driving and there is also a limit of six miles an hour when passing a stationary tram. If the present provision were properly policed there would be no need for the amendment. There is not nearly so much congestion now as there will be under the new provision. During the last tram strike I found that on Unley Road, which is very narrow, the traffic flow was much freer than in all the years I have known this road. I am looking forward to the day when buses will supersede trams on all narrow roads. In my district there are four very narrow highways on which trams operate. I refer to the Kingswood, Unley, Hyde Park and Goodwood services.

With cars parked on the side of the road at tram stops it is impossible for another

motorist to pass. During the debate it has been said that many motorists already stop before passing a stationary tram, and I often do it. I have in mind two stops at which the tram driver stops to punch the clock, where traffic congestion often occurs. The driver may be a minute or two early arriving at the clock and waits for the correct time to arrive before punching it. Under the proposal a motorist would first have to stop and wait to see that everything was clear before proceeding. I have in mind clocks at the corner of Unley Road and Park Terrace and another near the Torrens Arms Hotel. At the latter place there are often two stationary trams, one waiting to return to the city, and the other to go through to Mitcham. With motor cars parked nearby many motorists are often held up, but under the proposed law the position will be more confusing.

I agree with Mr. Fred Walsh's amendment to prohibit the parking of motors at tram stops. That already applies on Unley Road. An area 60ft. long is marked off where parking is prohibited. One is opposite my place, and I consider it a valuable idea. The proposed innovation will involve councils in added expense in the preparation of signs, and yet they will get nothing under the Act to help in this direction. It might be a good idea if the honourable member also provided that tram stops shall be efficiently lighted. At some of these places there is practically no lighting. Here again the councils will have to meet the cost of lighting, despite the fact that the Government will collect additional revenue. Better lighting should be provided at the main tram stops. I suppose the poor old council inspector will be called upon to police the position.

The provision that a motor vehicle should be permitted to proceed to the right against the red light provided no traffic is coming from the right is worthy of a trial. The vehicle approaching from the left could be easily slowed down to permit the other vehicle to proceed. It would appear that the authorities are too anxious to erect stop signs. At the Cross Road intersection with the railway at Unley Park is a stop sign, wig-wag and flashing light, and yet nearby at another crossing there is no stop sign. At least there should be some uniformity in these matters. At the main Mitcham railway crossing on Unley Road there is no stop sign. Either there should be stop signs at all railway crossings in the metropolitan area, or

none. At the Cross Road railway intersection a train passes only about once every hour, and even when there is no train approaching one will often see a long stream of motors waiting to proceed. In these circumstances motorists are compelled to waste much time, and in addition there is the wasteful running of their motor engines in neutral. With the exception of the points I have mentioned I am fully in accord with the Bill. If it does not work as well as we hope, no doubt it will be reviewed and members will have another opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—Legislation of this sort should not be brought before Parliament very frequently, and should be carefully considered before decisions are arrived at. It should then be allowed to rest for a time because so many people are affected by it. Probably all citizens, whether motorists, motor cyclists, or pedestrians, are in some way affected and we should not be hasty in amending it from time to time, for it is not like the Licensing Act or the Lottery and Gaming Act, copies of which are posted in hotels and at racecourses, or like awards and determinations, which are posted in workshops so that people may see them. People must memorize the provisions of this legislation from the details they see in the daily press.

The committee that recommended the provisions of this Bill are to be commended for the time and thought they spend in considering traffic problems. There is a humane task for, after all, these problems involve not only the transport of goods but also the safety of the public. Although the committee probably made its recommendations after much deliberation Parliament should not agree to them without mature consideration. I am sure the committee, which realizes the difficulties in this matter, would appreciate criticism, for possibly they were not unanimous in their findings. Though motorists and motor cyclists are generally blamed for accidents, I submit that bad roads and poor lighting cause many accidents. Some country members complain about poor country roads, but there are equally bad roads in the metropolitan area, particularly in the western suburbs. I refer not only to roads in recently developed areas but also to some constructed 30 or 40 years ago which are now in a bad state of repair. As one who has a knowledge of the difficulties which face councils in finding the money for the construction and upkeep of

roads, I realize the poor condition of many roads is not their fault. Suburban and country roads should be improved and this task must eventually become a responsibility of the Government because of the high cost of construction and maintenance. Councils, both metropolitan and country, are called upon to construct and maintain roads which are only partly used by their ratepayers and which are used mainly by others who as taxpayers should be called upon to contribute to their upkeep. I do not know another city of the size and importance of Adelaide which has such poor lighting in its suburbs, particularly the western suburbs. In my opinion this is a contributing factor to road accidents. It has been suggested that the accident rate has been considerably reduced, and the Premier said he had figures to prove that, but, although that reduction is praiseworthy, it is more in the nature of a miracle or the result of good luck. I am surprised to see the number of unroadworthy vehicles in present day traffic. Associated with that obsolete type of vehicle one often finds a poor driver who, driving his boneshaker with the curtains up, crouched over the wheel and oblivious of all other traffic, clings to the centre of the road. That type of driver is known to all members. There is also the driver who wants to show how quickly he can get from one place to another so that he can boast to his friends of the speed at which he travels. These drivers are no good from the point of view of the ordinary road user, and they should be prevented from behaving as they do. Fortunately, their numbers are very few because the great majority of motorists and motor cyclists are courteous and careful in their handling of their vehicles and machines.

Some people claim that motor cyclists are the number one menace on our roads and that many show off on their big machines, the very power of which is an inducement to the motor cyclist to speed when he thinks there is no chance of his being detected by the police. He is a menace, but I consider the biggest menaces are some Adelaide taxi drivers, who seem to ignore the provisions of the Road Traffic Act and dodge in and out of traffic at will. How they avoid meeting with more accidents than they have is beyond my comprehension. I would appreciate figures showing the number of accidents in which taxi drivers and civilian drivers respectively are involved, and I am sure a comparison of those totals, shown as percentages of the total number of taxis and private motor cars on the road, would be unfavourable to the taxi drivers. Anyone who

uses the Anzac Highway and the Gawler Road on race or trotting meeting days knows something of the way taxi drivers ignore all rules of road courtesy. It seems they have a licence to do that and that the police do not take the same strict notice of their breaches of the Road Traffic Act as they do of those committed by other road users, particularly motor cyclists. Attention should be drawn to that fact and action taken.

The problems of city traffic must give citizens food for thought. I hope the day is not far distant when the poles in the centre of King William Street will be removed. In their position they constitute a grave danger, and, in the event of a motor vehicle getting slightly out of control, the driver would have no chance to correct it before it crashed into a pole. While they are there provision should be made for the free and rapid flow of traffic so as to prevent congestion and resultant accidents. Although the Bill provides for a right hand turn by a motorist at an intersection at which traffic lights are installed, I do not think a right hand turn should be permitted at any time in King William Street between the Post Office and North Terrace. That may seem hard, particularly when applied to those times of the day not considered busy periods, but there are few daylight hours during which King William Street is not busy, and the banking up of traffic before turning to the right could constitute a serious road block which could be avoided by the elimination of the right-hand turn in this street. My argument is supported by the fact that between about 4 and 6 p.m. the police ban right-hand turns in King William Street, and there must be some reason for this ban. If it is necessary during those hours, it is equally necessary at other times of the day. The Bill provides that a motorist may turn right against the red light if the road is clear. In his second reading explanation the Minister said this law obtained in New South Wales, Queensland and New Zealand and that it had been asked for by the Adelaide city council. We can appreciate the council's request because it intends to install a new type of traffic light at the corner of Grote Street and West Terrace, Currie Street and West Terrace, and Hindley Street and Morphett Street. If motorists are not permitted to turn right against the red light at these places the scheme will not operate, but these are the only places where it should be permitted.

Mr. Dunks—If a motorist approaching the green light wants to turn right, but waits

until the traffic is clear, what is the position of the man behind him who wants to turn right immediately?

Mr. FRED WALSH—It would add to the congestion. The provision would be unnecessary in King William Street. The practice of making the "U" turn is dangerous and is usually adopted by the taxi driver. He will swing from the stream of traffic on one side of the road, across a tram and into the traffic on the other side. I have seen some near accidents where this has been done. There should be a clear flow of traffic through King William Street all day, and it would be possible if there were no right-hand turns and the "U" turn were eliminated. The city council has provided lanes for pedestrians crossing King William Street and according to by-laws they must cross there or at intersections. If it is good enough to control pedestrians who cross King William Street it is good enough to control vehicles, so the "U" turn should be eliminated. In Los Angeles and some other large American cities if a pedestrian is walking across a lane the motorist must give way, and it should apply in King William Street.

Mr. Dunks suggested that there should be stop signs on North Terrace opposite the railway station. The time is not far distant when we must have a subway at this point and it would not be a serious engineering problem. The subway could start from the low level of the concourse at the station. Only a small portion of the roadway would have to be taken up and if necessary a portion of the buildings on the southern side could be purchased. No doubt the State Traffic Committee has considered this matter. I have no doubt that there is no other way to provide a safe crossing for the pedestrians. The traffic on North Terrace is increasing day by day. It is a wise provision not to make motorists wait at "stop" signs until all the traffic on the left has gone. On Friday nights when I have come into the city along Hilton Road to cross West Terrace I have been held up for as long as 10 minutes waiting for the traffic to clear, and it has been on the side where there is no "stop" sign, so it can be imagined what the position must be on the opposite side where there is a "stop" sign. Many motorists get impatient and take a risk by moving off. Many do not give way to vehicles on their right. I hope the provision for giving way to the vehicle on the right will be adhered to strictly.

The matter of having rear lights and reflectors on bicycles is perhaps not important, but in the interests of the cyclists

steps should be taken to see that either the rear light or the reflector, or both can be seen clearly. Particularly on winter nights motorists have difficulty in seeing the rear lights on bicycles because often the rider's overcoat covers the light. Cyclists should be protected against themselves. If action were taken against them they would soon realize that they must obey the law. I am not convinced of the need for motorists to stop when approaching a stationary tram. I have seen the system operate in other States and I have been in motor cars where the driver has speeded up to pass a tram before it stopped. On one occasion when going from Essendon Airport to Melbourne a friend of mine speeded up to pass a tram before it stopped and almost knocked over an elderly person, and for the time being I was turned against the need for motorists to stop before passing a stationary tram. In all our laws we need uniformity as much as possible. It is needed in the interests of the Australian people generally and it should be the aim of all Governments. For that reason, if for no other, I support the provision making it compulsory for motorists to stop when approaching a stationary tram. Trams are on the way out. Almost monthly the Tramways Trust, under its new plan is eliminating trams from certain routes, which is a good thing. The sooner they are completely eliminated the better it will be, but I do not include the Glenelg tram, because it runs in an enclosed area and is of a different type.

Mr. Shannon—It is really an electric train.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. Members of the first A.I.F. who were in Egypt will recall that exactly the same type of tram ran between Cairo and Heliopolis. It is fast becoming universal to eliminate trams and install in their place either diesel buses or electric trains. The sooner we are able to get rid of them from the streets of Adelaide and suburbs the sooner will a menace to the public be removed.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—The State Traffic Committee which was set up to investigate our traffic laws has done good work, and this legislation is largely the result of recommendations it has made to the Government. Since the Road Traffic Act was passed motor traffic has increased enormously. Although the provision relating to the speed at which a vehicle can pass a stationary tramcar has worked very well, no distinction was made between a tram line in a busy road and one in an outlying area, such as at a terminus, or where it runs along a terrace. A contrast can be made between tram stops on the Enfield

Road and in Barton Terrace, North Adelaide. Enfield Road is almost as narrow as Unley Road and very often motorists must halt at tram stops because of parked vehicles, although they are permitted to proceed at six miles an hour. The traffic police administer this law very well, although sometimes not as sympathetically as they might, because although often motorists are reported for passing stationary tramcars at a little more than the permitted speed, glaring instances of exceeding the statutory speed limit are overlooked. The present law relating to the speed past a tramcar has worked very well, and I, like many other members, feel there is no need to force vehicles to stop.

During the last 10 or 12 years heavier vehicles have come on to our roads which were not constructed to carry them, and there is no doubt in my mind that this has contributed very materially to the breaking up of some of our main roads. It is not only the heavy weight, but that combined with the excessive speed at which these vehicles travel, particularly on the open roads. This is one reason why there should be a strict curtailment on the speed of vehicles. Some semi-government bodies have been content to allow these heavy vehicles on the road because materials can be carried on them without very much handling. An instance of this is the freighting of electricity poles to Woomera and other places by vehicles belonging to the Electricity Trust, because once loaded these goods reach their destination without any more handling. The honourable member for Flinders suggested it would be better to construct greater mileages of light roads than smaller mileages of roads to take heavy traffic, and I agree with this, because some country roads carry only light traffic and light sealed roads would last a long time. On the other hand, however, there are some main highways which should certainly be constructed to carry heavy traffic and to last for a number of years.

Recently an ambulance was involved in a serious accident while proceeding to the scene of a collision, and during the last few years there have been a number of similar incidents. As the honourable member for Unley pointed out, the human element is involved, and it should be the aim of ambulance drivers as well as others to exercise reasonable care, even though they have the right of way and are permitted to travel more quickly than other vehicles. The human element plays a large part in every accident, even in railway catastrophes which have occurred in other parts of

the world and in our own country. Many accidents could be avoided if the drivers would only drive with every possible care. With the exception of the clause relating to passing stationary tramcars, I support the Bill.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I congratulate the committee which has made the recommendations as a result of which this Bill was introduced. I have always recognized the services rendered by this body in an honorary capacity in an effort to preserve life in our community. There has been a united effort throughout the Commonwealth to bring about a lessening of fatalities from accidents. Last Sunday night I had the pleasure of listening to a broadcast from Brisbane of the Quiz Kids, a session which has become very popular throughout Australia, and I heard a speech made by the chairman of the Australian Road Safety Council. He said that legislation to preserve life has no effect, but that there should be education and courtesy, and I agree with him. It was encouraging to learn that there has been a decrease of 10 per cent this year in deaths from accidents compared with last year. When it is realized that this percentage represents 200 lives saved, it will be appreciated just what excellent work the Road Safety Council and other organizations have done to save lives. It was rather amazing that the broadcast was made in Queensland which had the highest record of fatalities for many years. Every other State showed a decrease for this year except Queensland, which showed an increase.

I was surprised to learn the percentages of fatalities in the different methods of transport: air travel one per cent, boat travel three per cent, rail seven per cent, and road 89 per cent. Every organization in Australia desirous of preserving life has a mighty task to perform. This cannot be brought about by legislation, but the Road Safety Council and other organizations will have to appeal to people to exercise courtesy. Each year the traffic laws are reviewed, but we cannot claim that the amendments have brought about a decrease in fatalities, because that is beyond our control. Indeed, as other speakers have pointed out, much confusion is created by a number of amendments because many drivers do not comprehend the rules made from year to year. This has made it difficult for all types of drivers, and has not helped to eliminate loss of life. For a number of years there has been severe loss of life through motor cycle accidents. I think most members will agree this has been brought about by

two causes. Firstly, some motor cyclists are not courteous and secondly, and perhaps more important, the machines they ride are too powerful. Apparently it is the aim of every manufacturer to outdo his competitor. Some machines can travel at 90 miles an hour without effort. Further, it is difficult to handle some of them at less than 30 miles an hour in top gear. If we could control the speed and power of motor cycles we should save many lives.

I commend the activities of motor cycle bodies. I am president of the Semaphore Motor Cycle Club, which has joined with the Road Safety Council to foster courtesy. The council offers trophies to the clubs, which conduct courtesy trials about every fortnight in and around Adelaide. The popularity of these trials proves that motor cyclists value life. I believe that the standard of driving and courtesy displayed by motor cyclists is better than it has been for many years.

Clause 5 appeals to me because it gives the Registrar power to suspend or cancel the licence of a driver who has been disqualified for driving in another State. Any person committing an offence in another State and having his licence suspended should not be permitted to drive a vehicle in South Australia. I realize most members have no desire to delegate powers, but this is one that we can endorse.

Mr. Macgillivray—The Registrar will only be able to suspend the licence of a person already licensed under our Act.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, but we should give him that power. Clause 10 also appeals to me. Most members have referred to the need for a push cycle to be fitted with a red reflector. This amendment will be the means of reducing accidents. I do not drive a motor car, but I know that many accidents involving cyclists for which motorists have been blamed have occurred on dark or wet nights. However, it is often hard to see a cyclist on such nights and I agree with the member for Thebarton that reflectors should be fitted to protect the cyclist. Even though the accident may be the fault of the cyclist we can appreciate the ill effects on the motorist.

Mr. Dunks—Does the honourable member know that the rear light on a cycle must be visible for 200ft.?

Mr. TAPPING—No, but I have never seen one that was visible at that distance. If it were possible I would legislate for red reflectors to be placed on dogs, which are a menace and cause many accidents. The cost of fitting

reflectors to cycles will be minute and will be offset by a reduction in accidents. The clause compelling motorists to stop at stationary tram cars is a good one. It will bring about uniformity with other States, but if all motorists respected the rights of pedestrians it would be unnecessary. Often we see pedestrians going for their lives to avoid serious accidents. Some motorists act like maniacs. The member for Unley said driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor was responsible in a large measure for this, but although more drivers have been prosecuted for this offence I do not think there have been as many fatalities recently from this cause.

Drivers will not have to stop at safety zones, which is regrettable. Although people use these safety zones often motorists drive through the zones killing or maiming people. In Committee we should seriously consider bringing safety zones within the ambit of the clause. The existing fine of £20 for failure to stop after an accident is too low for such a serious offence. It is proposed to make the maximum penalty six months' imprisonment if a person is killed or injured and this will be a more effective deterrent. I am not enthusiastic about the Bill because a little courtesy and co-operation by road users would bring better results than amending legislation from year to year, as this confuses rather than helps drivers.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—We are indebted to the member for Port Adelaide for his description of biddies. Motor body firms may be granted permission to use four-wheel trailers to deliver motor bodies to Port Adelaide or the Mile End railway yard, but will they be able to classify them as biddies to obtain exemption from motor taxation? Clause 3 states:—

“Biddy” means a four-wheeled trailer constructed and ordinarily used for transporting cargo on wharves and jetties between ships and cargo sheds. The Registrar may without fee grant to any person a written permit authorizing him to draw unregistered biddies on roads by means of registered and insured motor vehicles.”

We should seriously consider the effect of the clause. I agree with clause 5, which enables the Registrar to cancel or suspend the licence of a driver disqualified for driving in another State. If a person breaks the traffic laws of another State he should not be allowed to drive in South Australia. There has been much discussion about the proposal to force a driver to unload excess cargo. It is difficult to detect this offence. If they think it possible to dodge

inspectors some people overload. We should make the penalty severe for people with two or three previous convictions. There is no doubt that in some district council areas overloaded semi-trailers cause untold damage to newly constructed roads. In many instances the hauliers know that their vehicles are overloaded and that they are causing damage. I can, however, visualize a carrier transporting a cargo of merchandise which might absorb water, with the result that before he reached his destination it could exceed the prescribed weight. The provision should be enforced with discretion. Some inspectors can be extremely officious; others can, without being less efficient, exercise leniency. Bicycles can represent a danger to motorists and I agree that they should be equipped with reflectors. It is extremely difficult for a motorist to detect the presence of a bicycle if he is being dazzled by the lights of an oncoming vehicle. Dazzling headlights are a menace but I have never heard of a prosecution against a person who has failed to dip his lights.

Mr. Corcoran—Some of the old model lights cannot be dipped.

Mr. FLETCHER—I realize that. As a rule a driver will signal that the lights of an oncoming car are dazzling and they will then be dipped. Recently, a man was killed in my district because the driver of the vehicle which struck him was dazzled by approaching headlights. The driver signalled on several occasions that he was being dazzled but the other driver did not dip his lights. There are many stop signs on Cross Roads between Goodwood Road and the big tree at Burnside. Two of them show out vividly because the street lights are set at an angle and clearly illuminate them, but some of the others are poorly illuminated and it is quite easy for a driver not accustomed to travelling on that road to pass them. Several members have referred to the provision relating to compulsory stopping at stationary tramcars. The only reason I can imagine for that provision is that we are attempting to make our laws uniform with those of other States. I have not heard of any bad effects of the provision that a person must not pass a stationary tramcar at more than six miles an hour. The average motorist is sympathetic to tram passengers and shows them courtesy. If cars are parked on the side of Hyde Park Road, which is a narrow thoroughfare, it is impossible to pass a tramcar except at a stop. If motorists are compelled to stop for stationary trams

chaos could result and traffic could be delayed.

I do not favour permitting a motorist to cross against a red light under any circumstances. I was impressed with the working of pedestrian lanes in Western Australia. Motorists there respect pedestrians who are crossing and the police are severe on pedestrians who do not use pedestrian lanes. That rule should be enforced in Adelaide because pedestrians in Rundle Street frequently resemble a flock of sheep crossing at all angles. There are many safety lanes and the motorist could easily permit the pedestrian to have the right of way at them. Clause 18 relates to damage to roads and works. Many carriers and motorists cause considerable damage to new roads and roads in the course of construction. The road that passes my house at Mount Gambier carried a considerable amount of traffic including vehicles carting timber from large privately-owned forests and the costs of reconstruction of that road were enormous. Despite all the cautions issued, some carriers refused to keep off the road, with the result that it had to be closed for about two months to enable it to be repaired and bituminized. That shows how thoughtless some road users are. These are some of the difficulties met with by the Highways Department and councils in constructing roads when they have speed hogs and those who overload their vehicles using them. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. SHANNON moved:—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it has power to consider an amendment dealing with the exemption from motor registration fees of tractors used by primary producers in drawing trailers.

Motion carried.

Mr. TEUSNER moved:—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to notice of damage to roads.

Motion carried.

Mr. FRED WALSH moved:—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to the prohibition of parking at tram stops.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Permits and exemptions for unregistered biddies."

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am pleased that it is proposed to extend relief to the users of biddies by not calling upon them to register

and insure them. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles will have power to authorize a person to use these unregistered biddies on roads. I draw attention to new section 7d (5):—

A permit granted under this section shall be sufficient authority for any act or omission purporting to be authorized thereby.

It would appear that not only acts of commission, but also acts of omission are to be condoned. I should like the Premier to say what is meant by "purporting" as used in the subsection.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—These small biddies are used on the wharves, but occasionally must travel from one wharf to another and pass over a road in the process. As they are now included under the Act, without this clause it would be necessary to register them and also to cover them under the third party insurance provisions. The Government does not consider these vehicles should be registered or insured for they are not road users in the normal sense. This is a similar concession to that given to farmers in respect of tractors which must traverse a public road from one farm to another.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Does the exemption provided in this clause also apply to farm tractors and trailers towed by farm tractors on the road?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Registrar has already full power along the lines indicated by the honourable member, and on occasions he grants permission for the use of such vehicles in ways which are not covered by the Road Traffic Act. For instance, he has power to permit a primary producer's vehicle to be taken along the road without a registration fee being paid. The provision in this clause for permits and exemptions for unregistered biddies is not peculiar, for it applies to other types of vehicles.

Mr. DAVIS—These biddies are similar to trailers used by the B.H.A.S. which are not licensed to operate outside the works. On occasions the Registrar has permitted their use on the road, and in one case the Treasurer permitted their use in a procession.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Power to compel unloading of excess weight."

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—This clause is one of the most objectionable features in the Bill, and I doubt very much whether its provisions could be implemented. It is a definite

attack on the road haulier and would make it impossible for him to carry on. He is sometimes forced by the conditions under which he operates to overload his vehicles. He is usually a young man who has invested all his money in his vehicle. Some people would sooner trust their goods to the road haulier than to the railways. They are being deliberately driven off the road by Government action. In times of emergency they do their best and are commended by both Commonwealth and State Governments, but very soon after they are fined for breaches of the law. One week they are heroes and the next they are vagabonds and scoundrels. This provision is another move to make it impossible for young road hauliers to carry on.

Mr. Corcoran—It will be administered with discretion.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—At one time a member of the legal fraternity in this House frequently pointed out that the courts take no notice of the intention of Parliament, only what is written into legislation. This provision says that the driver may be directed to off-load any excess. Who will be responsible for the goods unloaded and whose goods will be unloaded? There may be on the truck goods belonging to six owners. This is one of the most vindictive and vicious provisions ever considered. I make no plea for the man who deliberately breaks the law and I do not object to a fine being imposed when a breach occurs, but I am opposed to this proposal to off-load goods, because goods not belonging to the driver will be concerned. Can the Premier explain the reason for this vindictive and vicious attack on road hauliers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has been proved conclusively that overloaded vehicles have caused much damage to roads. I could tell the honourable member of a road where through fast travelling and overloading of vehicles for several weeks during a strike expenditure of several hundreds of thousands of pounds was necessary. That is something we cannot afford in this State. In many instances the motorist concerned makes little or no contribution to the roads of this State. Under reciprocal agreements, a licensed vehicle from New South Wales is permitted to come here and operate on our roads. Some of these vehicles carry 30 or 40 tons, and the only contribution they make is a nominal charge for a permit by the Transport Control Board.

Mr. Frank Walsh—They pay £5 only.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know the exact figure, but it is a very nominal amount. On general principles we must be prepared to enforce some control over the weight and speed of vehicles using our roads.

Mr. Macgillivray—But this clause has nothing to do with speed of vehicles.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I realize that, but I am laying down what I believe to be the essentials for road traffic. While the honourable member was making his eloquent speech, I examined this clause closely and I propose to ask that its consideration be deferred until the remaining clauses are dealt with, because in my opinion there may be some technical difficulties in the definitions; one moment the maximum load is dealt with, and in another place the axle load. I would also like to check on whether the suggested 10cwt. is a fair margin. Although that provision has operated in another State, I would like to examine what is involved in the 10cwt. maximum load and axle load, because there could be some confusion in administration and possibly the provision may be somewhat harsh if put into absolute effect. I agree with the honourable member that we must make laws on the assumption that they will be carried out. We should not deliberately pass a Bill thinking that it will not be administered in the way it is enacted, but should make our laws realistic and carry on under the assumption that the inspectors operating under the Act will in fact endeavour to carry them out fairly and squarely. For this reason I move that consideration of this clause be deferred until the remaining clauses of the Bill are dealt with to enable me to examine the clause further.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Before the Premier comes to a final decision on this, I desire to bring to his notice further information which I am sure he has overlooked. He mentioned a road that was damaged by heavy traffic over a short period and which cost the taxpayers £100,000 to repair, but the fact is that this road was never meant to carry heavy traffic because it was too lightly constructed. It was a waste of taxpayers' money. On the other hand I can take the Premier to a main interstate road which has been down for 15 years and which carries heavy interstate traffic as well as local traffic, and nothing has been done to it during that period except filling up potholes. Last year the Highways Department laid a road between Berri and Barmera, and irrespective of what type of traffic goes over it no money will need to be spent on it for many years.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member must confine his remarks to the subject matter of the clause.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the motion is going to be debated, I ask leave to withdraw it.

Leave granted; motion to defer consideration of clause withdrawn.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The Premier's statement that motorists do not contribute to the upkeep of roads makes me sick every time I hear it, and I have heard it from both sides of this Chamber. No section of the community pays more for the upkeep of what they use than the motorist, and I include every section of the motoring public. Over the last 20 years total revenue from road users was £403,247,583, and of this only £94,507,613 has been allocated to the States for road purposes.

The CHAIRMAN—I cannot allow the honourable member to proceed, because he is making a second reading speech and the matter we are considering is the power to unload excess weight. The member must confine his remarks to that.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The Premier said that road users do not contribute to the upkeep of the roads.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! I cannot allow a general debate, and I have allowed the member a fair amount of latitude.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In one year motorists paid to the Commonwealth and the States £83,000,000 in various forms of taxation, so how dare anyone, the Premier of this State or anyone else, say that the motor user is not paying for the roads? Earlier today it was suggested that the railways—

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I have heard statements which are absolutely inaccurate, blaming one of the hardest working and most worthy sections of the community for something for which they are not responsible. They are the people who keep the wheels of industry spinning, but we continually hear that they are damaging our roads. They pay for our roads, and if we got all the money that the Commonwealth Government is collecting in various forms of taxation on the motoring public we could provide first class roads throughout the country.

Mr. SHANNON—Once more Mr. Macgillivray is championing the cause of the lawbreaker rather than the law abider. He is happy to see a carrier overloading his vehicle, thus causing unnecessary wear upon our highways to the detriment of the man obeying the law.

He was a little hazy in suggesting that there might be repercussions from this clause and that some men would lose their jobs if they off-loaded valuable cargo. I have seen evidence of a good, sealed, hills highway being seriously damaged by heavy loads. It was one of the first sealed roads in the State and the foundations did not break down until heavy vehicles were taken over it. Obviously, the fines inflicted for overloading have not been a sufficient deterrent. Hauliers have been able to pay them and still make handsome profits. They are not worried about the cost of maintaining highways. People breaking the law get no sympathy from me. The inspector will be able to determine whether the load itself, or the load on any axle, is excessive. The maximum axle load varies with vehicles, for the biggest vehicles being eight tons. Mr. Brookman pointed out to me that it would be possible for the maximum load not to exceed the permitted weight, but for the load on any one axle to be excessive. That would cause just as much damage as the overall load being too heavy. I suggest that we delete "maximum load or" and "vehicle or" in the following line. The load upon each axle has a greater influence upon the wear on the road than any other factor. Instruments are available to test the weight on any axle.

Mr. PATTINSON—Mr. Macgillivray said this clause was introduced by bureaucrats to put road hauliers off the road, but it was introduced on the recommendation of the State Traffic Committee.

Mr. Macgillivray—You only take evidence from bureaucrats.

Mr. PATTINSON—Members of the committee are the Commissioner of Police, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, the Chief Engineer and General Manager of the Tramways Trust, the chairman of the Insurance Underwriters' Association, the president of the Road Transport Association of South Australia (Mr. Fred Stevens—a peculiar type of bureaucrat!). The secretary of the Royal Automobile Association is on the committee; he is an extraordinary sort of bureaucrat! Other members are the secretary of the Transport Workers' Union, and I do not know that he is particularly bureaucratic, and the deputy chairman is the Parliamentary Draftsman and I am chairman—two arch-bureaucrats, of course! This clause arose from a reference by the Government to the committee. The committee was requested to investigate what steps should be taken under the Road Traffic Act or any other Act to regulate heavy vehicular traffic on

the roads in the interests of road safety and to prevent undue damage to roads. The committee asked representatives of the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures to give evidence; also a super-bureaucrat, the member for Onkaparinga. The president of the Road Transport Association, the secretary of the Royal Automobile Association, Mr. Bean and I closely examined the matter and came to the conclusions expressed in a report of the committee presented about 18 months ago, which stated:—

The committee concurs with the conclusions reached by the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures, viz.:—

- (a) As adequate rail and seat transport is not available, and cannot be made available under present conditions, road transport is essential to keep industry and commerce alive, which ultimately means keeping the people employed, housed and fed.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is a fairly liberal statement.

Mr. PATTINSON—It is hardly bureaucratic.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is a change, coming from the Government.

Mr. PATTINSON—It came from the State Traffic Committee. The report continued:—

- (b) For certain types of merchandise road transport has become essential, and for the economic operation of industry and commerce, and therefore the State, should remain an essential means of transport.
- (c) By virtue of these two considerations, attention should be concentrated, not on restricting road transport, but on asserting every effort and energy possible to provide adequate and properly constructed highways to cope with what must be an ever-growing demand for road transport.

Mr. Macgillivray would be wise to restrain his exuberance when suggesting that the recommendation of this committee is a recommendation of bureaucrats, because the committee has been far more liberal in its recommendations than the member for Chaffey suggests. They are, I suggest, constructive. Another passage of the report stated:—

The basic cause of the difficulties now being experienced is undoubtedly that the road itself was not constructed in a manner suitable for it to carry the volume and type of traffic to which it is now subjected.

Mr. Macgillivray—Where is that reflected in the Bill?

Mr. PATTINSON—We are considering clause 9.

Mr. Macgillivray—You are still side-tracking the issue and apologizing for the Government.

Mr. PATTINSON—The report continued:—

The committee has also given serious consideration to the manner in which undue damage to roads can be averted. The section of roadwork particularly affected is that between Tailem Bend and Bordertown. It was lightly constructed, but is now being subjected to use by a type of vehicle for which it was not intended. Evidence before the committee has shown that there has been many breaches of the existing law both in the overloading of vehicles beyond the legal limit and in driving at speeds in excess of that allowed by law on the basis of the overall weight of the vehicle. Section 174 of the Road Traffic Act was designed to protect the roads by restricting the speed of the vehicles according to their weight—the heavier the vehicle the slower the allowable permissible speed. The law restricting the weight of vehicles that can be driven on the roads is contained in Part IV. of the Road Traffic Act dealing with width of tyres. Although a number of convictions for offences of this kind have been obtained, the penalties are not sufficient to act as a deterrent. The Commissioner of Highways has suggested to the committee that the penalties for offences against Part IV. of the Road Traffic Act be increased and, in addition, that the police and inspectors of the Highways Department be given power to direct the driver of an overloaded vehicle to remove any excess load. Such a law is in force in Victoria and it is suggested it is an effective way of ensuring that owners of vehicles obey the laws by which the permissible load is fixed.

I only intervened at this stage to prove that this was not the action of bureaucrats. Members of the committee have gone a long way in an attempt to protect road hauliers generally, other roads users, and taxpayers, and it felt that some definite penalty should be imposed on the comparatively few reckless law-breakers.

Mr. HAWKER—A couple of years ago a Mr. Winnall, who lives on Prince's Highway, informed me that one of the main causes of accidents was the overloading on vehicles. He has given evidence before the State Traffic Committee and has a formula which he believes would be more satisfactory than the one at present in use of 8cwt. per inch of tyre width, with a maximum weight of eight tons. If we take the bigger-sized tyre, 825 x 20, 10-ply, used on the big loads, the manufacturer's limit is 2,900 lb., and with four tyres on the back the maximum total allowable load is five tons; but if the wide based rims are used the manufacturer allows an extra 20 per cent, which brings the total to six tons actual load. Under the formula in the Act one is allowed an eight ton maximum, which is 30 per cent above what is recommended by the manufacturers. The Act allows, if anything, too

generous a load weight on the axle, considering the types of tyres used. It is well-known that a fine does not worry these people, in view of the profit they make on hauling. The provision now under consideration is the only way to protect our roads from abuse by hauliers.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Can the chairman of the State Traffic Committee say on whom the penalty will finally rest, assuming that the load is too heavy and part of it has to be taken off and some of the goods are damaged in being unloaded, or have to be left in a place that is unsuitable? Will the truck driver have to pay, the owner of the truck, or the consignor of the goods? I consider that if any member of this Committee is trying to fight a difficult case he should get some protection.

The CHAIRMAN—Does the honourable member consider that he is not getting protection compared with any other honourable member?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Not necessarily, but there are unnecessary interjections, possibly made unwittingly, when I am trying to put a point. I have also noticed that when the Premier gives a lead there is a tendency for those on the back benches to laugh, snigger and make unseemly noises.

The CHAIRMAN—If it is the Committee's desire, I am prepared to stop all interjections.

Mr. QUIRKE—I consider that the amendment is harsh and penalizing and I will not be a party to it. Some time ago weighbridges were installed at considerable expense on main roads leading into Adelaide. I have passed along the Main North Road at least twice every week for sometime and at different times of the day and yet I have never seen the weighbridge being used. It would be interesting if this Committee could have placed before it figures showing the number of vehicles which had been put over these expensive weighbridges. The intention was that they should be used to weigh vehicles considered to be overloaded. I should like to know if they are operated for that purpose, or are they now to be put into operation and if a vehicle is found to be overloaded is the additional weight to be taken off? Were these weighbridges installed in anticipation of this clause being included in the Act? I do not agree with those who say that a fine is not a deterrent to those who overload. I happen to know the freight rates charged by some of these vehicles and a fine of £100 as mentioned by one honourable member would definitely take the profit out of their operations. If those vehicles which are

suspected of being overloaded were repeatedly run across these bridges and a fine imposed on each occasion they were found to be overloaded, the practice would soon be stopped without the use of this kind of measure, and it would not be long before vehicles would not be overloaded. I hold no brief for law breakers, and people overloading their vehicles in defiance of the law should be punished with a heavy fine. There is no necessity to interfere with the load. Most drivers do not own the vehicle or the load but drive for the big transport companies. If those vehicles were put over the weighbridges provided for that purpose there would be no need for the drivers to be told to unload the excess weight. Has any provision been made for a mobile crane with which to unload some of these vehicles? It will be needed in some cases. The fact that this provision is law in another State is no reason why it should become law here. I oppose the clause.

The House divided on clause 9:—

Ayes (29).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, John Clark, Geoffrey Clarke, Corcoran, Davis, Dunnage, Dunstan, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, and Hutchens, Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. William Jenkins, Jennings, McIntosh, Michael, O'Halloran, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Shannon, Tapping, Teusner, Travers, Frank Walsh, Fred Walsh, and White.

Noes (3).—Messrs. Fletcher, Macgillivray (teller), and Quirke.

Majority of 26 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3) (GOVERNOR'S ALLOWANCE).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BUILDING CONTRACTS (DEPOSITS) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HONEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 19, at 2 p.m.